

I, personally, don't live in an area that benefits from the Instant Traffic and Weather on XM Radio - as does anyone who doesn't live in Boston, New York City, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, Minneapolis/St. Paul, Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, Phoenix, Dallas/Ft. Worth, Houston, Atlanta, Tampa, Orlando, or Miami/Ft. Lauderdale. What's my point? I subscribe to XM Radio even though I don't get traffic and weather from them. What I do get is better variety, better programming, better coverage, and commercial-free music. They have a product that is in all ways superior to local radio. Any number of media outlets exist that can perform the same services as local radio - and much better - and the majority of them can be found online or in print. While some may try to defend this legislation as protection of local business, and defense against corporate takeover, such defenses simply don't stand up under scrutiny, since the VAST majority of local radio stations are owned by companies such as Clear Channel. The FCC has already made it clear that it doesn't mind monopolies, a la Gannet Newspapers, Clear Channel radio stations, and AT&T, so why not allow XM to benefit consumers with superior services, and benefit American media with a little competition?